

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 3, and 14 have been amended. Claims 17 and 29-34 have been cancelled.

The Examiner allowed claims 18-29. Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 18-29.

Initially, the Examiner indicated that claims 6-11 and 14-15 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Applicant submits that the allowable status of these claims is unchanged by the present amendment and, therefore, claims 6-11 and 14-15 will not be discussed further herein.

The Examiner objected to claims 17 and 29 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 17 and 29 have been cancelled.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 12 and 17 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by WO 0041475 (U.S. Pat. No. 6,824,657) to Fischer. The Examiner's rejection is traversed for the following reason.

Applicant discloses a holding device for magnetic parts. The holding device comprises a holder that includes multiple cavities arranged in a row for the purpose of holding parts. The holding device further comprises a bar arranged parallel to the

cavities and includes multiple-spaced magnetic bodies. An end portion of the bar is adapted to engage an actuation structure such that the actuation structure moves the bar from a first position to a second position. When the bar is in the first position the magnetic bodies are aligned with the cavities and the magnetic attraction from the magnetic bodies holds the parts in the cavities. When the bar is in the second position the magnetic bodies are not aligned with the cavities and the magnetic bodies do not hold the parts in the cavities.

Fischer does not teach all the features of claim 1. More specifically, Fischer does not teach "wherein an end portion of the bar is adapted to engage an actuation structure to move the bar between the first and second positions." Fischer discloses a component carrier 11 for holding components 12 during a coating process. The component carrier 11 includes a support frame 22 and a carriage 23. Holding magnets 32 are positioned on the carriage 23 to hold the components 12 in place during the coating process.

Referring to column 9, line 40 through column 10, line 10 of Fischer, the component carrier 11 is placed into a bracket 13 during the component mounting process. Once the component carrier 11 is placed into the bracket 13 the magnets 32 partially move from a holding position into a neutral zone. This allows a slight magnetic force to act on the component 12 during the mounting process. Once the mounting process is complete the component carrier 11 is removed from the bracket 13. The magnets 32 then shift to the maximum holding position where they remain during the coating process. After the coating process is complete the component carrier 11 is placed back into the bracket 13 at a position rotated 180° with respect to the

component mounting position. In this position the magnets 32 move from the maximum holding position into the neutral zone. The magnetic force acting on the components 12 is now minimal, thus, allowing for easy removal of the components 12 from the component carrier 11. In Fischer there is no actuation structure that acts on the component carrier 11 to move it from a first position to a second position. Rather the component carrier 11 must be physically removed from the bracket in order to move the carriage into the holding position. Thus, Fischer does not teach an actuation structure to move the bar between the first and second positions. Therefore, Fischer does not teach all the features of claim 1.

Finally, Applicant would like to note that the above feature added to claim 1 is similar to the language of allowable claim 18. Thus, Applicant respectfully contends that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 3-5, 12 and 17 depend either directly or indirectly on claim 1. Thus, all arguments pertaining to claim 1 are equally applicable to these claims and are herein incorporated by reference.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer.

Claims 2, 4, 13 and 16 depend either directly or indirectly on claim 1. Thus, all arguments pertaining to claim 1 are equally applicable to these claims and are herein incorporated by reference.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is

invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. HON-14810.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By /David E. Spaw/
David E. Spaw, Reg. No. 34,732

4080 Erie Street
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7836
(216) 566-9700